

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of September 11, 2007, claims 1-40 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, 13, 16-17, 20, 24-25, 29, 32 and 35 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-40 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 16-20, 22-24, 26-28, and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolzien* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,761,606) (“*Wolzien*”) in view of *Moon* (U.S. Pat. No. 3,919,479) (“*Moon*”) in further view of *Dureau* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,721,958) (“*Dureau*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant’s independent claims 1, 3, 7, 16, 22 and 32 each claim subject matter relating to a database unit for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to a commercial message.

Wolzien and *Moon* fail to disclose a database unit for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to a commercial message.

Dureau, similarly, fails to disclose a database unit for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to a commercial message. Instead, *Dureau* discloses a receiver which determines if a notification is trusted by examining the source of the notification and the channel the notification was broadcast on. See 6,721,958, Col. 6, l. 20-55.

As the Applicant’s current specification discloses, by providing a database unit for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to a

commercial message it is possible to generate descriptors for a commercial message as well as to store a commercial message portion corresponding to a reference commercial message from a aired signal for storage and demonstration. The apparatus disclosed in *Dureau* is incapable of producing this effect.

Therefore, because *Dureau*, *Wolizen* or *Moon* or any combination of the three fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claims 1, 3, 7, 16, 22, 26, and 32, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 4-5, 8-9, 17-20, 23-24, 27-28, and 33-38 depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 3, 7, 16, 22, 26, and 32, those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2, 6, 10-12, 21, 25, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolzien* in view of *Moon* in view of *Dureau* and further in view of *Matthews* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,721,958) ("*Matthews*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 16, 22, 26, and 32 are patentable over *Wolizen* and *Moon* as discussed above.

Matthews, similarly, fails to disclose anything pertaining to a database unit for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to a commercial message.

Therefore, because *Dureau*, *Wolizen*, *Moon* or *Matthews* or any combination of them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claims 1, 3, 7, 16, 22, 26, and 32, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 2, 6, 10-15, 21, 25, and 29-31 depend, either directly or

indirectly from claims 1, 3, 7, 16, 22, 26, and 32, those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolzien* in view of *Moon* in view of *Dureau* and further in view of *Matthews* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,721,958) (“*Matthews*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 13 recites:

“a database unit for registering at least the commercial message and access site information corresponding to detailed information furnishing unit which finishes detailed information related to said commercial message.”

Wolizen and *Moon* fail to disclose a database unit for registering a commercial message and access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to a commercial message.

Dureau, similarly, fails to disclose a database for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to the commercial message. Instead, *Dureau* discloses a receiver which determines if a notification is trusted by examining the source of the notification and the channel the notification was broadcast on. See 6,721,958, Col. 6, l. 20-55.

As the Applicant’s current specification discloses, by using a database for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to the commercial message it is possible to generate descriptors for the commercial message as well as to store a commercial message portion corresponding to a reference commercial message from a aired signal for

storage and demonstration. The apparatus disclosed in *Dureau* is incapable of producing this effect.

Therefore, because *Dureau*, *Wolizen*, *Moon* or *Matthews* or any combination of them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 13, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 14-15 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 13, those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolzien* in view of *Moon* in view of *Dureau*, and further in view of *Goldschmidt* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,444) ("*Goldschmidt*").

Claim 32 is patentable over *Wolizen*, *Moon* and *Dureau* as discussed above.

Goldschmidt, similarly, fails to disclose anything pertaining to a database unit for registering access site information corresponding to detailed information relating to a commercial message.

Therefore, because *Dureau*, *Wolizen*, *Moon* or *Goldschmidt* or any combination of them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 32, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 39 and 40 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 32, those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, to Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 11, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000